



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO. |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|

08/895,936 7/17/97 Wisniewski 17882-702

| EXAMINER |
|----------|
|----------|

FORD

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

3743 25

DATE MAILED:

### EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Mesiti (3) Mr. Ford  
(2) Mr. Hutton (4)

Date of interview Jan 4, 02

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: Newly proposed claims 69-89

Identification of prior art discussed: 1992 Article by Wisniewski and (briefly) the Kalhori + Ramadhyani article

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Counsel pointed out

A thermal gradient  $\theta$  in Figure 3b which has a downward slope from the edge of the fin toward the wall of the container. This downward gradient was asserted not to occur in the prior art 1992 Wisniewski device because the fins (centrally mounted) do not extend closely enough to the wall. The Examiner expressed

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview. his skepticism of this alleged fact and asserted that at different times during the cooling period the gradient would change and that even in the prior art a downward

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given on month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

not a quickly as it would develop in a device wherein the fin was more closely spaced to the wall. How would the physics change?